

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 7, 14, 21 and 23 have been amended. Support for the changes to claims 1, 7, 14, 21 and 23 may be found in the specification at, for example, page 9, paragraph 30.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for allegedly failing to comply with the writing description requirement for reciting subject matter not sufficiently described in the specification; and rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,530,875 to *Wach*.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Applicant has deleted the phrase "prioritizes the servicing of interrupt requests." from claims 1, 7, 14, 21 and 23. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Applicant traverses the Examiner's rejections of the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,530,875 to *Wach*. In order to properly anticipate Applicant's claims under Section 102(b), each and every element of the claim in issue must be found, either expressly described or under the principles of inherency, in a single prior art reference. Further, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. (See M.P.E.P. § 2131 (8th Ed., rev. Sept. 2007), emphasis added.) *Wach* cannot support a rejection of claim 1 under Section 102 because it fails to disclose, at least, Applicant's claimed "interrupt controller."

The Examiner apparently asserts that *Wach*'s interrupt sources and group flag register 44 correspond to Applicant's claimed "interrupt sources," and "interrupt controller," respectively. (Office Action, p. 5.) Applicant disagrees. Group flag register 44 is a storage

device that holds group interrupt flags that are read by a processor 14. (*Wach*, col. 5:16-18, 6:22-30.) This function of group flag register 44 comports with the plain and ordinary meaning of the term "register," which is "computer circuit that holds values of internal operations." (*See, e.g.*, Answers.com, <http://www.-answers.com/topic/status-register?cat=biz-fin>, accessed on February 4, 2008.) Thus, group register 44 simply stores data and does not have any control function. As such, group flag register 44 cannot be considered to be an "interrupt controller" that "[assigns] priorities to each of the plurality of interrupt inputs," (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1.

In one embodiment noted by the Examiner, group register 44 can provide an interrupt request signal to processor 14 via line 26 when one or more of storage locations GF are set. (*Id.* at cols. 4:29-34, 10:4-67.) For instance, the interrupt request signal may be produced by having all storage locations GF connected to the input of an OR gate with the output of the OR gate connected to line 26. (*Id.* at col. 5:7-9.) However, generating an interrupt request signal for processor 14 cannot be considered to correspond to "assigning priorities to each of the plurality of interrupt inputs by the interrupt controller" (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner argues that group flag register 44 can be considered to correspond to the claimed "interrupt controller" because different priorities can be assigned to interrupt sources corresponding to the flag storage locations GF in the group flag register 44. (Office Action, p. 17.) To the contrary, these priority assignments are made by processor 14 via association registers 46. (*Wach*, col. 8:45-9:34.) As noted above, group flag register 44 is merely a storage device. Accordingly, it cannot perform "assigning priorities," as claimed.

For the reasons above, *Wach* does not teach Applicant's claimed "interrupt controller." Moreover, *Wach* says nothing with regard to "selectively enabling interrupt requests ... based on the assigned priorities of the interrupt inputs" (emphasis added), as

also recited in claim 1. *Wach*, therefore, cannot support a rejection of claim 1 under 25 U.S.C. § 102(b). Applicant requests that the rejection of claim be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Independent claims 7, 14, 21 and 23 recite similar subject matter to that recited in claim 1. Thus claims these claims are allowable for similar reasons to those set forth above with regard to claim 1

Dependent claims 2-6, 8-13, 15-20 and 22 are allowable at least due to the corresponding dependence from independent claims 1, 7, 14, 21 and 23.

### **Conclusion**

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this paper, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone Applicant's undersigned representative so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

If additional fees are required for any reason, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-4800 the necessary amount.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: March 3, 2008

By: /Steven Ashburn/  
Steven Ashburn  
Registration No. 56,636

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620